

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 have been amended and new claims 21-25 have been added. Support for the claim amendments and new claims may be found at least at paragraphs [0018], [0020], [0021], [0026], [0029], [0030] and [0031] of the present application and therefore no new matter has been added. Claims 7 and 10 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 1-6, 8, 9, and 11-25 are pending and under consideration. Claims 1, 4, 9, and 16 are independent claims. Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 102:

Claim 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,652,824 to Hirayama et al. ("Hirayama"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 recites at least the following:

checking whether one of a plurality of multi-language selection function key is selected from a key input unit by a user and displaying a language selection menu including a plurality of language choices when the multi-language selection function key is selected;

Hirayama fails to suggest or disclose at least all of the above-claimed features. FIG. 5A of Hirayama illustrates an example of an English and Japanese representation where "the user can select a world language he or she can understand" (col. 8, lines 58-62). Although Hirayama allows a user to select a language, the cited portions of Hirayama provide no detail as to how such selection takes place. If the above rejection is to be maintained, Applicants respectfully request that any subsequent Office Action provide a specific paragraph number and figure reference, or a specific indication if an assertion of inherency is being relied upon.

Amended independent claim 1 recites at least the following:

converting the output audio streams from digital to analog audio signals and simultaneously outputting the analog audio signals to the user via two or more independent audio channels;

Applicants further assert that the cited portions of Hirayama fail to suggest or disclose at least all of the above-claimed features.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants submit that amended independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Hirayama, and should be allowable for at least the above-mentioned reasons. Since similar features recited by each of the independent claims 4, 9, and 16, with potentially differing scope and breadth, are not suggested or disclosed by Hirayama, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 4, 9, and 16 also allowed.

Regarding the rejection of claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 11-15 and 17-20, these claims depend directly or indirectly on one of independent claims 1, 4, 9, and 16, and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the reasons noted above.

Amended dependent claim 2 recites at least the following:

wherein when it is determined in the checking that one of a plurality of multi-language selection function key is not selected, a default mode is entered, wherein in the default mode, a language previously designated by the user as a default is selected, an audio decoder corresponding to the default language is designated, and an audio stream corresponding to the default language is decoded using the designated audio decoder.

Hirayama fail to suggest or disclose at least all of the above-claimed features. The Office Action relies on col. 9, lines 29-34 of Hirayama which states:

If neither the speech select button nor the subtitle change button is operated for a certain period of time, the reproduction mode selected at the first menu screen will be effected [*sic*]. The speech output mode and the subtitle display mode can be changed during operation on the reproduction apparatus side.

However, the above-cited section of Hirayama fails to describe a default mode because it first requires that a reproduction mode be selected at the first menu screen. A true default mode describes an option that is selected *automatically*, unless an alternative is specified.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended dependent claim 2 patentably distinguishes over Hirayama, and should be allowable for at least the above-mentioned reasons.

NEW CLAIMS:

Applicants further submit that new claims 21-25 patentably distinguish over Hirayama and therefore should be allowed.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Nov. 14, 2007

By: 

David J. Cutitta
Registration No. 52,790

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501